

REMARKS

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 64-68 and the Examiner's indication of allowability for claims 51-53, 60-63, 72-74, and 78. Claims 47, 49, 50, 52, 54, 57, 58, 61, 69, 73, and 75 are amended in view of the subject matter expressed to be allowable by the Examiner. Claims 1-46, 48, 51, 60, and 72 have been cancelled without prejudice to their underlying subject matter. Claims 47, 49, 50, 52-59, 61-71, and 72-78 are pending. Since the prior amendment, filed November 30, 2005, was not entered by the Office, Applicant again attaches at Appendix A replacement FIG. 15 and a mark-up of the amendments to the drawings.

Applicant responds to the Office Action's indication of reasons for allowance in relation to claims 64-68. The Office Action states that the references of record do not teach or suggest at least "a memory device comprising: at least one first epitaxial silicon stud with a silicide cap and at least one second epitaxial silicon stud without a silicide cap; and a conductive plug within said insulating sidewall and in electrical contact with said second epitaxial silicon stud." While Applicant generally agrees with this reasoning, Applicant respectively asserts that the prior art also fails to teach or suggest other features recited by the claims as well.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention claimed. Applicant respectfully traverses this objection.

The Office Action indicated that no drawing shows "an interconnect line . . . in electrical contact with said first conductive stud (i.e., claim 1)." This feature of the claim(s) is shown in, for example, FIG. 15 where the first conductive stud (22a) is shown

to be in electrical contact with the overlying interconnect line (26) through the cap (24) over the stud (22a) (although the cap is absolutely necessary). Although not believed necessary, Applicant submits a replacement FIG. 15, which adds a reference "26" to more clearly label the interconnect line (26) in electrical connection with contact stud (22a). Mark-up and clean versions of this replacement drawing are attached at Appendix A, with changes shown in red. No new matter is added.

The Office Action also indicates that in FIG. 16, which shows a cross section of the structure of FIG. 15 through line XVI-XVI, the interconnect line (26) is insulated from both conductive studs (22b). This is correct because FIG. 16 shows how some studs (22b) are so insulated from the overlying contact line (26), which is electrically connected to an adjacent contact stud (22a), as shown in FIG. 15.

FIG. 16 is also objected to because it allegedly has a cross-section not corresponding with the line XVI-XVI of FIG. 15. The line XVI does indeed correspond to the drawing of FIG. 16; it passes through the middle of the drawing of FIG. 15. Because of the perspective view shown in FIG. 15, the line does, however, bisect the location of the contact stud (22b) as shown in FIG. 16. It is the same cross-section line as shown in FIG. 1 (i.e., line II-II). The replacement FIG. 15 shifts the position of the contact (36) slightly to make this more clear.

In view of the above and based on the replacement drawing submitted herewith, Applicant respectfully requests that the replacement drawings be entered and the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim 47 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,705,838 ("Jost et al."). Claims 48-50 and 54-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §

103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,188,112 ("Bryant") and U.S. Patent 6,069,060 ("Matsumoto"). Claims 69-71 and 75-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jost et al. in view of Bryant and Matsumoto and also in view of U.S. Patent 6,051,509 ("Tsuchiaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The claims are amended to incorporated subject matter indicated as not disclosed, taught or suggested by the art of record, from claims allowed or expressed as allowable by the Examiner. If view of the amendment, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The amendment of the claims should not be understood to be an accession that the claims were not patentable prior to the amendment, but is made solely for the purpose of expediting the allowance of all claims and the grant of patent. The rejections of the claims are respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Applicant believes all pending claims are in immediate condition for allowance and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims (47, 49, 50, 52-59, 61-71, and 72-78).

Dated: December 29, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Ryan H. Flax

Registration No.: 48,141

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &

OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorney for Applicant

APPENDIX A

Amendments to the drawings:
Replacement FIG. 15
(mark-up and clean versions)

